

## REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated September 7, 2005, and have made amendments to the claims. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 11 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1, 10 and 18 are independent claims.

The amendment to claim 11 is intended to correct a typographical error. Therefore, the amendment is not related to patentability.

No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

### § 103 Rejections

Claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishi et al. (“Kishi” U.S. Patent No. 5,687,083). Claims 5, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishi in view of Hulverscheidt et al. (“Hulverscheidt” U.S. Patent No. 6,762,696). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

With this paper, independent claims 1, 10 and 18 have been amended to recite the shape of the turn guide arrow corresponds to an angle between the approach road and one of the plurality of departing roads. It is respectfully submitted that neither Kishi nor Hulverscheidt disclose this limitation.

It is respectfully noted that the Federal Circuit has provided that an Examiner must establish a case of prima facie obviousness. Otherwise the rejection is incorrect and must be overturned. As the court stated in In re Rijkaert, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993):

“In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. Only if that burden is met, does the burden of coming forward with evidence or argument shift to the applicant. ‘A prima facie case of obviousness is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art.’ If the examiner fails to establish a prima facie case, the rejection is improper and will be overturned.” (citations omitted.)

It is respectfully noted that, in rejecting claims 5 and 13 under § 103(a), both of which recite “rotating the upper body and the head according to the calculated rotation angle,” the Examiner never addressed this limitation with regard to Kishi or Hulverscheidt. See Office action at paragraphs 9 and 10. It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Kishi or Hulverscheidt is “rotating the upper body and the head according to the calculated rotation angle” disclosed and, therefore, neither Kishi nor Hulverscheidt disclose that the shape of the turn guide arrow corresponds to an angle between the approach road and one of the plurality of departing roads.

It is respectfully noted that the only calculation of the “rotation angle” between the “road on which the car is driving” and the “three roads connecting to the junction” that is disclosed in Kishi is with regard to “voice expression.” Col. 5, line 51 to col. 9, line 43 and FIGS. 4-12.

It is respectfully asserted that independent claims 1, 10 and 18 are allowable over the cited references. It is further respectfully asserted that claims 2-4 and 6-9, which depend from claim 1, claims 11-17, which depend from claim 10, and claims 19 and 20, which depend from claim 18, also are allowable over the cited reference.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1- 20 of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Date: February 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA

By: 

Richard C. Salfelder  
Registration No. 51,127  
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 035884

801 South Figueroa Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: (213) 623-2221  
Facsimile: (213) 623-2211